

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,887	07/30/2002	Jurgen Engel	103832-512-NP	6290
. 75	90 09/03/2004		EXAMINER	
Goodwin Procter LLP			GALVEZ, JAMES JASON	
599 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			. 1647	
			DATE MAILED: 09/03/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/748,887	ENGEL ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	J. Jason Galvez	1647					
The MAILING DATE of this communication	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address					
Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statut. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will Any reply received by the Office later than three months afte earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a nication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON II, by statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 3/17/2004.						
)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition fo	r allowance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice	under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
7) Cłaim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the I	Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	a) accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	e correction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	r foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		,,,,,					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have been received in A	pplication No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of	the priority documents have been	received in this National Stage					
application from the International	ıl Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action to	for a list of the certified copies not	received.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)					
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C.

121:

5

10

15

20

 Claims 1-6, drawn to a method of treatment using an LHRH antagonist, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

- 2. Claim 7, drawn to LHRH antagonists, classified in class 530, subclass 300.
- 3. Claims 8-11, drawn to a method of making a pharmaceutical containing LHRH antagonists, classified in class 435, subclass 68.1.

The inventions 1-3 are distinct from one another with explanations as follows:

Inventions 1 and 3 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are drawn to different methods that have different starting materials, different modes of operation, different functions, different objectives, different effects, and/or different outcome measures.

Inventions 2 and 1 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be

Art Unit: 1647

5

10

15

20

shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products of invention 2 can be used to block the effect of LHRH agonists.

Inventions 2 and 3 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process of making the pharmaceutical composition can be used to make another materially different pharmaceutical composition.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, separate search requirement, and divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between the product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior

Art Unit: 1647

5

10

15

to final rejections or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 5

Art Unit: 1647

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

A. Cetrorelix

Application/Control Number: 10/748,887

B. Teverelix

C. Antide

5

10

15

20

D. Abarelix

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 6 (<u>for example</u>) is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added.

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Art Unit: 1647

5

10

15

20

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Upon election of either Group 1 or 2, a species election from each Group A-D must be chosen to be fully responsive.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **J. Jason Galvez**, **Ph.D**. whose telephone number is **571-272-2935**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday 9 AM to 5 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Brenda Brumback**, **Ph.D**. can be reached at **571-272-0887**.

Art Unit: 1647

Page 7

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10

5

JJG 9/2/2004

> JANET ANDRES PRIMARY EXAMINER